arXiv:1301.3441v2 [math.AC] 22 Jan 2013

NON-SIMPLICIAL DECOMPOSITIONS OF BETTI DIAGRAMS OF COMPLETE INTERSECTIONS

COURTNEY GIBBONS, JACK JEFFRIES, SARAH MAYES,
CLAUDIU RAICU, BRANDEN STONE, BRYAN WHITE

Abstract. We investigate decompositions of Betti diagrams over a polynomial ring within the framework of Boij–Söderberg theory. That is, given a Betti diagram, we decompose it into pure diagrams; however we relax the requirement that the corresponding degree sequences for these diagrams be totally ordered. In doing so, we are able to define a multiplication law for Betti diagrams that respects the decomposition. In the more traditional sense, the decomposition of complete intersections of codimension at most 3 are also computed as given by the totally ordered decomposition algorithm obtained from [ES09]. In higher codimensions, obstructions arise that inspire our work on an alternative algorithm.

1. Introduction

Algebraists have long accepted that it is useful to discard structure and work with numerical invariants; the new insight arising from Boij–Söderberg theory is that focusing on numerical invariants *up to rational multiple* can also yield information about modules. Thinking of Betti diagrams as integral points on rays in a rational vector space produces a convex polytope with a simplicial structure (as first conjectured in [BS08, Conjectures 2.4, 2.10]), and this structure leads to Algorithm 2.2 for decomposing Betti diagrams into nonnegative rational combinations of pure diagrams that are linearly independent [ES09, Decomposition Algorithm]. Recent results harness the power of Algorithm 2.2; examples include a proof of the Multiplicity Conjecture of Herzog, Huneke, and Srinivasan (see [HS98,BS08,ES09]), finding a polynomial bound on the regularity of an ideal in terms of half its syzygies [McC12] and obtaining a structural result for decompositions of Betti diagrams of a class of Gorenstein ideals [NS12, Theorem 5.4].

However, Algorithm 2.2 clashes with some algebraic structures like the tensor product, and the output of the algorithm can be hard to predict even for seemingly simple objects like complete intersections. We will illustrate this point via an example, and refer the reader to Section 2 for some of the necessary background and notation. Let $R = \mathbb{Q}[x,y,u,v]/(x^1,y^2,u^4,v^8)$. Then, decomposing the Betti table of R via Algorithm 2.2, we obtain the sum:

$$\begin{aligned}\beta(R) &= 168\pi(0,1,3,7,15) + 60\pi(0,2,3,7,15) + 210\pi(0,2,5,7,15)\\ &\quad + 30\pi(0,4,5,7,15) + 60\pi(0,4,6,7,15) + 240\pi(0,4,6,11,15)\\ &\quad + 240\pi(0,4,9,11,15) + 60\pi(0,8,9,11,15) + 30\pi(0,8,10,11,15)\\ &\quad + 210\pi(0,8,10,13,15) + 60\pi(0,8,12,13,15) + 168\pi(0,8,12,14,15).\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 13D02; Secondary: 13C99.

In Section 4 we illustrate that there is not a simple closed formula for such decompositions. If we are willing to relax the requirement of Algorithm 2.2 that the corresponding degree sequences form an ordered chain, then there turns out to be a remarkably simple decomposition for $\beta(R)$. We have

$$\beta(R) = (1\cdot 2\cdot 4\cdot 8) \sum_{\sigma\in \mathrm{Perm}(\{1,2,4,8\})} \pi(0,\sigma(1),\sigma(1)+\sigma(2),\sigma(1)+\sigma(2)+\sigma(4),15). \tag{2}$$

In contrast with the formula from (1), it is easy to parametrize the degree sequences that arise in (2). Even better, the coefficients are uniform: each coefficient equals the multiplicity of R! On the other hand, equation (2) involves 24 summands, whereas equation only involves 12. The decomposition in (2) has origins in Boij-Söderberg's [BS08, Section 4]; we prove that a natural generalization of the formula in (2) holds in general. We further prove that (2) follows immediately from a natural multiplication law for Betti diagrams that is induced by the tensor product of free complexes (see Section 5). From this perspective, equation (2) is simply the expanded version of a product of pure Betti diagrams:

$$\beta(R) = \pi(0,1)\cdot\pi(0,2)\cdot\pi(0,4)\cdot\pi(0,8). \tag{3}$$

In our view, the most interesting aspect of this work is the somewhat surprising insight that there are cases where the coefficients in a decomposition behave well if and only if the decomposition does not respect the partial order. From this perspective, the uniqueness of the decomposition provided by Algorithm 2.2 is, at times, a handicap instead of a boon. Once we adopt this perspective, the multiplication law for pure diagrams and its corresponding formula are actually quite elegant.

In Section 2, we develop the necessary background and notation. Section 3 shows how complicated Algorithm 2.2 can be, even in low codimension. We further explain more difficulties in Section 4 for the codimension four case. In Section 5 we show how to write the multiplication pure diagrams in terms of pure diagrams and give applications in the complete intersection case.

2. BASIC DEFINITIONS AND NOTATION

Let $S = \mathbf{k}[x_1,\dots,x_n]$ be a polynomial ring over a field $\mathbf{k}$. We view $S = \oplus_{i=0}^{\infty} S_i$ as a graded ring with the standard grading. For a graded S-module M and any integer t, we denote the twist of M by t as the module $M(t)$ whose graded pieces are defined by $M(t)_i = M_{i+t}$.

Given M an S-module of finite length, it has a minimal graded free resolution of the form

$$0 \longleftarrow M \longleftarrow \bigoplus_j S(-j)^{\beta_{0,j}} \longleftarrow \bigoplus_j S(-j)^{\beta_{1,j}} \longleftarrow \cdots \longleftarrow \bigoplus_j S(-j)^{\beta_{c,j}} \longleftarrow 0$$

The number c is an invariant of M and is called the projective dimension of M, denoted $\mathrm{pd}(M)$. The integer β_{ij} is the number of degree j generators of a basis of the free module in the i^{th} step of the resolution. These β_{ij} are independent of the choice of minimal free resolution, and we call these invariants the graded Betti numbers. The Betti Diagram of M is defined to be

$$\beta(M) = \begin{pmatrix} \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \iddots \\ \beta_{0-1} & \beta_{10} & \beta_{21} & \cdots \\ \beta_{00} & \beta_{11} & \beta_{22} & \cdots \\ \beta_{01} & \beta_{12} & \beta_{23} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}.$$

In this paper, we consider $\beta(M)$ as an element of the vector space $V = \oplus_{i=0}^{n} \oplus_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$. If $D \in V$, then we say that D is a diagram.

Viewing $\beta(M)$ as a diagram, we would like to decompose it into a combination of "pure diagrams". We say $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ is a degree sequence if $d_i < d_{i+1}$ for all i and that $\mathbf{d} \leqslant \mathbf{d}'$ if $d_i \leqslant d_i'$ for all i. A chain of degree sequences is a totally ordered collection $\{\cdots < \mathbf{d}^0 < \mathbf{d}^1 < \cdots < \mathbf{d}^s < \cdots\}$. We say that M has a pure resolution if $\beta(M)$ has at most one non-zero entry in each column. For example, if $S = k[x, y, z]$ and $M = k[x, y, z]/(x^2, xy, y^2, xz)$ then

$$\beta(M) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & - & - & - \\ - & 4 & 4 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

gives a pure resolution. If M has a pure resolution, then for each nonnegative integer $i \le \mathrm{pd}(M)$ there exists an integer d_i for which $\beta_{ij}(M) \neq 0$ if and only if $j = d_i$. In this case we say that M has a pure resolution of type $\mathbf{d} = (d_0, d_1, \cdots, d_n)$. Further, if $\mathbf{d}$ is a degree sequence then we can construct a diagram $\pi(\mathbf{d}) \in V$ by

$$\pi(\mathbf{d})_{ij} = \begin{cases} \prod_{k\neq j} \frac{1}{|d_j - d_k|}, & j = d_i \\ 0, & j \neq d_i \end{cases}.$$

For example, if $\mathbf{d} = (0, 2, 3, 4)$, then

$$\pi(\mathbf{d}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1/24 & - & - & - \\ - & 1/4 & 1/3 & 1/8 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In proving the conjectures of M. Boij and J. Söderberg [BS12], D. Eisenbud and F.O. Schreyer show there is a unique decomposition of Betti tables in terms of $\pi(\mathbf{d})$ [ES09].

2.1 ([BS08, ES09]). *Let $S = k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ and M an S-module of finite length. Then there is a unique chain of degree sequences $\{\mathbf{d}^0 < \cdots < \mathbf{d}^s\}$ and a unique set of scalars $a_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that*

$$\beta(M) = \sum_{i=0}^{s} a_i \pi(\mathbf{d}^i).$$

The unique decomposition in Theorem 2.1 respects the partial order (see [BS12, Definition 2]) of the $\mathbf{d}^i$'s and is obtained by applying the greedy algorithm to a special chain of degree sequences. As defined in [BS08], the maximal and minimal shifts of degree i of a module M are $\overline{d}_i(M) = \max\{j \mid \beta_{ij}(M) \neq 0\}$ and $\underline{d}_i(M) = \min\{j \mid \beta_{ij}(M) \neq 0\}$, respectively. If M is Cohen-Macaulay, then the sequences defined by $\overline{\mathbf{d}} = (\overline{d}_0, \overline{d}_1, \cdots, \overline{d}_c)$ and $\underline{\mathbf{d}} = (\underline{d}_0, \underline{d}_1, \cdots, \underline{d}_c)$ are degree sequences.

Algorithm 2.2 (Totally Ordered Decomposition Algorithm [ES09]). *Let $S = k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ and M be a finitely generated S-module of finite length. Set $\beta = \beta(M)$.*

Step 1: *Identify the minimal degree sequence $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$ of β;*

Step 2: *Choose* $q > 0 \in \mathbb{Q}$ *maximal such that* $\beta - q\pi(\underline{\mathbf{d}})$ *has non-negative entries;*
Step 3: *Set* $\beta = \beta - q\pi(\underline{\mathbf{d}})$*;*
Step 4: *Repeat Steps 1-3 until* β *is a pure diagram;*
Step 5: *Write* $\beta(M)$ *as a sum of the the* $q\pi(\underline{\mathbf{d}})$ *obtained in the above steps.*

We note that our choice of $\pi(\mathbf{d})$ differs from the choices used in [BS08] and [ES09]. In [BS08], they choose the pure diagram with $\beta_0 = 1$; in [ES09], they choose the smallest possible pure diagram with integral entries. Since the pure diagrams with degree sequence $\mathbf{d}$ form a one-dimensional vector space, this different choice only affects the coefficients that arise in the algorithm. As we will note in Section 5, one advantage to our choice is certain uniform formulas.

Let $D \in V = \oplus_{i=0}^{n} \oplus_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$ be a diagram. Define the dual of D, denoted D^*, via the formula

$$(D^*)_{ij} = D_{n-i,-j},$$

and define twist $D(r)$ via the formula

$$D(r)_{ij} = D_{i,r+j}.$$

These definitions mimic the functors $\mathrm{Hom}_S(-,S) = -^*$ and $-\otimes S(r)$ for modules; one may check that $\beta(M^*) = \beta(M)^*$ and $\beta(M(r)) = (\beta(M))(r)$. In particular, if M is a Gorenstein module of finite length, the Betti diagram will be self-dual up to shift by $\mathrm{Reg}(M)$.

2.3 (Symmetric Decomposition [EKKS12],[NS12])**.** *Let* $S = k[x_1,\ldots,x_n]$ *and* M *a Gorenstein* S*-module of finite length. Then the decomposition of* $\beta(M)$ *via Algorithm 2.2 is symmetric; i.e.,*

$$\beta(M) = a_0\pi(\mathbf{d}^0) + a_1\pi(\mathbf{d}^1) + \cdots + a_1\pi(\mathbf{d}^1)^*(r) + a_0\pi(\mathbf{d}^0)^*(r)$$

where $r = \mathrm{Reg}(M)$*.*

3. Complete Intersections in Low Codimension

Let $S = k[x_1,\ldots,x_d]$ be a polynomial ring over a field k and let $f_1,\ldots,f_d$ be a homogeneous regular sequence. If $I = (f_1,\ldots,f_d)$, then the ring S/I is called a complete intersection. In this section we investigate the following question concerning the decomposition of Betti tables arising from complete intersections.

Question 3.1. *Let* $S = k[x_1,\ldots,x_d]$ *and* $I = (f_1,\ldots,f_d)$ *be an ideal of* S *generated by a homogeneous regular sequence with* $\deg(f_i) = e_i$*. Is there a relation between the Betti table decomposition from Algorithm 2.2 and the degrees* e_i*?*

As the Koszul complex of a complete intersection is a minimal resolution, we have that the Betti table of S/I is completely determined by the degrees e_i. Thus there is a relation and we would like to be able to write down the coefficients of the decomposition from Algorithm 2.2 in terms of the degrees. In codimension at most three, we are able to do this as the decomposition behaves uniformly. When the codimension is larger than three, many complications arise in the book keeping, leaving Question 3.1 unanswered.

Proposition 3.2. *Let* $S = k[x_1,\ldots,x_d]$ *and* $I = (f_1,\ldots,f_d)$ *be an ideal generated by a homogeneous regular sequence with* $\deg(f_i) = e_i$*. If* $d \leqslant 3$*, then the Betti table decomposition obtained from Algorithm 2.2 is completely determined by the degrees* $e_1,\ldots,e_d$*. In particular, for*

$d = 1$:

$$\beta(S/I) = e_1 \cdot \pi(0, e_1)$$

$d = 2$:

$$\beta(S/I) = e_1e_2 \cdot \pi(0, e_1, e_1 + e_2) + e_1e_2 \cdot \pi(0, e_2, e_1 + e_2).$$

$d = 3$: *If* $e_1 \leqslant e_2 \leqslant e_3$, *then*

$$\begin{aligned}\beta(S/I) = {} & e_1e_2(e_2 + e_3) \cdot \pi(0, e_1, e_1 + e_2, e_1 + e_2 + e_3) \\ & + e_1e_2(e_3 - e_1) \cdot \pi(0, e_2, e_1 + e_2, e_1 + e_2 + e_3) \\ & + 2e_1e_2(e_1 + e_3 - e_2) \cdot \pi(0, e_2, e_1 + e_3, e_1 + e_2 + e_3) \\ & + e_1e_2(e_3 - e_1) \cdot \pi(0, e_3, e_1 + e_3, e_1 + e_2 + e_3) \\ & + e_1e_2(e_2 + e_3) \cdot \pi(0, e_3, e_2 + e_3, e_1 + e_2 + e_3).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. For codimension 1, we have $S = k[x_1]$ and f_1 is a nonzero homogeneous element of degree e_1. The Betti table of $S/(f_1)$ is already pure so no decomposition is needed. Hence we have $\beta(S/(f_1)) = e_1 \cdot \pi(0, e_1)$.

For the codimension 2 case, let $S = k[x, y]$ and f, g be a homogeneous regular sequence of type (a, b). If we apply Algorithm 2.2 to $S/(f, g)$, we obtain the following decomposition:

$$\beta(S/(f, g)) = ab\pi(0, a, a + b) + ab\pi(0, b, a + b).$$

As for codimension 3, let $S = k[x, y, z]$ and let f, g, h be a homogeneous regular sequence of degrees a, b, c respectively. Set $M = S/(f, g, h)$. We must consider the following four cases: $a < b < c$; $a = b < c$; $a < b = c$; $a = b = c$.

Case 1. $a < b < c$.

We compute the decomposition of $\beta(M)$ into pure diagrams using Algorithm 2.2. For simplicity, set $\beta_0 = \beta(M)$ and notice that the entries in the $(0, 0)$ and $(3, a + b + c)$ positions of β_0 are both 1. As Algorithm 2.2 preserves codimension, we need not belabor the computations of the changing the entries in columns 0 and 3; mainly since there is only one entry in each of these columns. So let $\underline{\mathbf{d}}(\beta_0) = (0, a, a + b, a + b + c)$ and notice that $(\beta_0)_{1,a} = (\beta_0)_{2,a+b} = 1$.

By the definition of $\pi(\underline{\mathbf{d}}(\beta_0))$, we see that

$$\pi(0, a, a + b, a + b + c)_{1,a} = \frac{1}{ab(b + c)};$$
$$\pi(0, a, a + b, a + b + c)_{2,a+b} = \frac{1}{(a + b)(ac)}.$$

Analyzing the system

$$1 - q\frac{1}{ab(b + c)} \geqslant 0$$
$$1 - q\frac{1}{(a + b)(ac)} \geqslant 0,$$

according to Step 2 of Algorithm 2.2, we find that $q = ab(b+c)$ is the largest rational number making the system non-negative. Thus the $(\beta_0)_{1,a}$ entry will vanish before the $(\beta_0)_{2,a+b}$ entry.

Following Step 3 in Algorithm 2.2, set

$$\beta_1 = \beta_0 - ab(b+c)\pi(0,a,a+b,a+b+c) \tag{4}$$

and observe that $\underline{\mathbf{d}}(\beta_1) = (0,b,a+b,a+b+c)$ with $(\beta_1)_{1,b} = 1$ and $(\beta_1)_{2,a+b} = b(c-a)/c(a+b)$. We now analyze the system

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - q\frac{1}{ab(a+c)} &\geqslant 0 \\ \frac{b(c-a)}{c(a+b)} - q\frac{1}{ac(a+b)} &\geqslant 0, \end{aligned}$$

and see that $q = ab(c-a)$ satisfies the necessary conditions. Thus $(\beta_1)_{2,a+b}$ will vanish next and we set

$$\beta_2 = \beta_1 - ab(c-a)\pi(0,b,a+b,a+b+c). \tag{5}$$

Observe that $\underline{\mathbf{d}}(\beta_2) = (0,b,a+c,a+b+c)$ with $(\beta_2)_{1,b} = 2a/(a+c)$ and $(\beta_2)_{2,a+c} = 1$. Repeating the algorithm, we consider the system

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2a}{a+c} - q\frac{1}{b(a+c-b)(a+c)} &\geqslant 0 \\ 1 - q\frac{1}{b(a+c-b)(a+c)} &\geqslant 0, \end{aligned}$$

and find that $q = 2ab(a+c-b)$ is the appropriate choice. Setting

$$\beta_3 = \beta_2 - 2ab(a+c-b)\pi(0,b,a+c,a+b+c), \tag{6}$$

we see that $\underline{\mathbf{d}}(\beta_3) = (0,c,a+c,a+b+c)$ with $(\beta_3)_{1,c} = 1$ and $(\beta_3)_{2,a+c} = c-a/a+c$.

We now analyze the system

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - q\frac{1}{ac(a+b)} &\geqslant 0 \\ \frac{c-a}{a+c} - q\frac{1}{ab(a+c)} &\geqslant 0, \end{aligned}$$

and find that $q = ab(c-a)$ is the necessary choice. At this point we set

$$\beta_4 = \beta_3 - ab(c-a)\pi(0,c,a+c,a+b+c), \tag{7}$$

and notice that $\underline{\mathbf{d}}(\beta_4) = (0,c,b+c,a+b+c)$ with $(\beta_4)_{1,c} = a(b+c)/c(a+b)$ and $(\beta_4)_{2,b+c} = 1$.

Once again, we analyze the system

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{a(b+c)}{c(a+b)} - q\frac{1}{bc(a+b)} &\geqslant 0 \\ 1 - q\frac{1}{ab(b+c)} &\geqslant 0, \end{aligned}$$

and find that $q = ab(b+c)$ not only satisfies the conditions in Step 3 of Algorithm 2.2, but makes the whole system vanish. That is,

$$\beta_5 = \beta_4 - ab(b+c)\pi(0,c,b+c,a+b+c) = 0. \tag{8}$$

Combining Equations (4)-(8) yields the following result,

$$\begin{aligned}\beta(S/(f,g,h)) = {}& ab(b+c)\cdot\pi(0,a,a+b,a+b+c)\\ &+ab(c-a)\cdot\pi(0,b,a+b,a+b+c)\\ &+2ab(a+c-b)\cdot\pi(0,b,a+c,a+b+c)\\ &+ab(c-a)\cdot\pi(0,c,a+c,a+b+c)\\ &+ab(b+c)\cdot\pi(0,c,b+c,a+b+c).\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Using the same arguments as above, we obtain the following results for the remaining cases. Notice that these formulas can be retrieved by specializing (9) at the appropriate values.

Case 2. $a = b < c$:

$$\begin{aligned}\beta(S/(f,g,h)) = {}& 2a^2c\cdot\pi(0,a,2a,2a+c)\\ &+2a^2c\cdot\pi(0,a,a+c,2a+c)\\ &+2a^2c\cdot\pi(0,c,a+c,2a+c).\end{aligned}$$

Case 3. $a < b = c$:

$$\begin{aligned}\beta(S/(f,g,h)) = {}& 2ab^2\cdot\pi(0,a,a+b,a+2b)\\ &+2ab^2\cdot\pi(0,b,a+b,a+2b)\\ &+2ab^2\cdot\pi(0,b,2b,a+2b).\end{aligned}$$

Case 4. $a = b = c$:

$$\beta(S/(f,g,h)) = 6a^3\cdot\pi(0,a,2a,3a).$$

□

4. Examples in Codimension Four

As seen in Proposition 3.2, for codimension up to three, the decomposition via Algorithm 2.2 of a complete intersection behaves uniformly. That is, the coefficients can always be determined by one formula in terms of the degrees. This is not the case in codimension four or greater. The main point we want to make in this section is that one cannot express the Boij-Söderberg decomposition of a codimension four (or greater) complete intersection by a simple formula in terms of the degrees. To help us articulate this point, we create the following definitions.

Definition 4.1. Given a diagram $D \in V$, its elimination table has as its $(i,j)^{\text{th}}$ entry the integer k such that the k^{th} iteration of Algorithm 2.2 applied to D is the first iteration such that the $(i,j)^{\text{th}}$ entry becomes zero. The elimination order of a diagram $D \in V$ is the sequence whose k^{th} entry is itself the sequence

$$(i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_m)$$

where each i_ℓ has an integer j such that k is the $(i_\ell, j)^{th}$ entry of the elimination table.

Intuitively, the elimination order records the columns in which the entries of D are removed according to Algorithm 2.2, and the elimination table is a priori a finer version of the elimination order that records the row position as well. However, they are equivalent.

Remark. Given any diagram $D \in V$, the following pieces of data are equivalent:

1. The sequence of pure diagrams appearing in the Boij-Söderberg decomposition of D.
2. The elimination order of D.
3. The elimination sequence of D.

It is clear that from (1) we may find (2), and from (2) we determine (3). Given the elimination sequence, we may recover the sequence of pure diagrams appearing in the Boij-Söderberg decomposition recursively. Indeed, in Algorithm 2.2, the degree sequence of the pure diagram corresponding to the t^{th} iteration is given by the sequence of least degrees in each column after $t-1$ eliminations. We may read this in the elimination table as entries of least degree in each column (i.e., highest up on the page) among those with value at least t.

We consider the following examples with $S = k[x, y, u, v]$.

Example 4.2. For $I_1 = (x^1, y^2, u^4, v^8)$, the Betti table and elimination table of S/I_1 are are given below. The elimination table represents the elimination sequence $(1, 2, 1, 2, 3, 2, 1, 2, 3, 2, 3, (0, 1, 2, 3, 4))$. The first elimination occurs in column 1 and switches between columns without any multiple eliminations.

$$\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 1 & . & . & . \\
. & 1 & 1 & . & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & 1 & 1 & . & . \\
. & . & 1 & 1 & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & 1 & 1 & . & . \\
. & . & 1 & 1 & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & . & 1 & 1 & . \\
. & . & . & 1 & 1
\end{pmatrix}$$

(A) Betti Table of S/I_1

$$\begin{pmatrix}
12 & 1 & . & . & . \\
. & 3 & 2 & . & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & 7 & 4 & . & . \\
. & . & 6 & 5 & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & 12 & 8 & . & . \\
. & . & 10 & 9 & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & . & 12 & 11 & . \\
. & . & . & 12 & 12
\end{pmatrix}$$

(B) Elimination Table of S/I_1

Example 4.3. For $I_2 = (x^3, y^4, u^5, v^7)$, the Betti table and elimination table of S/I_2 are are given below. The elimination table for this module corresponds to the elimination sequence $(2, 1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 3, 2, (0, 1, 2, 3, 4))$. The first elimination in this example now occurs in column 2, and again the eliminations switch between columns.

$$\begin{pmatrix}
1 & . & . & . & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & 1 & . & . & . \\
. & 1 & . & . & . \\
. & 1 & . & . & . \\
. & . & 1 & . & . \\
. & 1 & 1 & . & . \\
. & . & 1 & . & . \\
. & . & 1 & . & . \\
. & . & 1 & 1 & . \\
. & . & 1 & . & . \\
. & . & . & 1 & . \\
. & . & . & 1 & . \\
. & . & . & 1 & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & . & . & . & 1
\end{pmatrix}$$

(C) Betti Table of S/I_2

$$\begin{pmatrix}
12 & . & . & . & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & 2 & . & . & . \\
. & 5 & . & . & . \\
. & 8 & . & . & . \\
. & . & 1 & . & . \\
. & 12 & 3 & . & . \\
. & . & 6 & . & . \\
. & . & 9 & . & . \\
. & . & 11 & 4 & . \\
. & . & 12 & . & . \\
. & . & . & 7 & . \\
. & . & . & 10 & . \\
. & . & . & 12 & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & . & . & . & 12
\end{pmatrix}$$

(D) Elimination Table of S/I_2

Example 4.4. Let $I_3 = (x^4, y^5, u^7, v^9)$. The Betti table and elimination table of S/I_3 is listed below. Here, the elimination sequence is $((1,2),(2,3),1,2,3,(1,2),(2,3),(0,1,2,3,4))$. Applying Algorithm 2.2 to S/I_3 shows multiple elimination on the first, second, sixth and seventh iteration. Notice that since only 8 eliminations occur, the Boij-Söderberg decomposition of S/I_3 has only 8 distinct pure diagrams occurring.

$$\begin{pmatrix}
1 & . & . & . & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & 1 & . & . & . \\
. & 1 & . & . & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & 1 & . & . & . \\
. & . & 1 & . & . \\
. & 1 & . & . & . \\
. & . & 1 & . & . \\
. & . & 1 & . & . \\
. & . & 1 & . & . \\
. & . & 1 & . & . \\
. & . & . & 1 & . \\
. & . & 1 & . & . \\
. & . & . & 1 & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & . & . & 1 & . \\
. & . & . & 1 & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & . & . & . & 1
\end{pmatrix}$$

(E) Betti Table of S/I_3

$$\begin{pmatrix}
8 & . & . & . & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & 1 & . & . & . \\
. & 3 & . & . & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & 6 & . & . & . \\
. & . & 1 & . & . \\
. & 8 & . & . & . \\
. & . & 2 & . & . \\
. & . & 4 & . & . \\
. & . & 6 & . & . \\
. & . & 7 & . & . \\
. & . & . & 2 & . \\
. & . & 8 & . & . \\
. & . & . & 5 & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & . & . & 7 & . \\
. & . & . & 8 & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & . & . & . & . \\
. & . & . & . & 8
\end{pmatrix}$$

(F) Elimination Table of S/I_3

These examples display the difficulty in identifying a formula for the coefficients of the codimension four case. Indeed, one can verify by hand that if $I = (x^a, y^b, u^c, v^d)$, with $a < b < c < d$, then the first elimination of S/I occurs in column 1 if $a(b + 2c + d) > c(c + d)$, in column 2 if $a(b + 2c + d) < c(c + d)$, and multiple elimination occurs in the first step if $a(b+2c+d) = c(c+d)$. Any formula for the coefficients thus breaks into cases depending on how the terms $a(b+2c+d)$ and $c(c+d)$ compare, and indeed into further nested cases to determine later steps in the elimination order. If we assume there are no multiple eliminations, there are a total of 9,240 possible elimination sequences. Although we have no reason to believe all 9,240 sequences are attainable, it does paint the picture of the road ahead.

5. Tensor products of diagrams

The cone of Betti diagrams has a natural multiplication operation induced by the tensor product operation on complexes. In this section, we give a formula for decomposing the product of two diagrams β and β' into a sum of pure diagrams, given the corresponding decompositions for β and β' respectively.

Definition 5.1. Let β and β' be Betti diagrams. The tensor product of β and β' is the diagram $\beta \cdot \beta'$ defined by

$$(\beta \cdot \beta')_{i,j} = \sum_{\substack{i_1+i_2=i \\ j_1+j_2=j}} \beta_{i_1,j_1} \cdot \beta'_{i_2,j_2}.$$

Note that if $C_\bullet$ and $C'_\bullet$ are complexes and $\mathrm{Tot}(C_\bullet \otimes C'_\bullet)$ is the total complex of the double complex $C_\bullet \otimes C'_\bullet$, then we have

$$\beta(\mathrm{Tot}(C_\bullet \otimes C'_\bullet)) = \beta(C_\bullet) \cdot \beta(C'_\bullet). \tag{10}$$

Note also that the tensor product of Betti diagrams is bilinear, i.e.,

$$\beta \cdot (\beta' + \beta'') = \beta \cdot \beta' + \beta \cdot \beta'' \quad \text{and} \quad (\beta' + \beta'') \cdot \beta = \beta' \cdot \beta + \beta'' \cdot \beta.$$

It follows that in order to give a decomposition of $\beta\cdot\beta'$ as a sum of pure diagrams, it suffices to do so in the case when β and β' are pure. Theorem 5.2 below explains how this can be done. We first introduce some notation.

Given a degree sequence $\mathbf{d} = (d_0, d_1, \cdots, d_n)$, its first difference is defined as the sequence

$$\Delta(\mathbf{d}) = (d_1 - d_0, d_2 - d_1, \cdots, d_n - d_{n-1}).$$

If furthermore e is an integer, we let

$$\Sigma(\mathbf{d}, e) = (e, e + d_0, e + d_0 + d_1, \cdots, e + d_0 + d_1 + \cdots + d_n).$$

Observe that

$$\Sigma(\Delta(\mathbf{d}), d_0) = \mathbf{d}.$$

For a sequence S we let $\mathsf{Perm(S)}$ be the set of permutations of S. If we write $S = \{s_1, \cdots, s_n\} = (s_1, \cdots, s_n)$, then we can identify $\mathrm{Perm}(S)$ with the set of permutations of $\{1, \cdots, n\}$, where $n = |S|$. We can also identify a permutation σ with the n-tuple $(s_{\sigma(1)}, \cdots, s_{\sigma(n)})$. Given disjoint ordered sets A and B, we let $\mathsf{Sh(A,B)}$ be the subset of $\mathrm{Perm}(A \cup B)$ that preserves the order of the elements of each of A and B. More generally, if $A_1, \cdots, A_n$ are ordered sets, we can define $\mathsf{Sh}(A_1, \cdots, A_n)$ to be the set of order preserving permutations of $A_1 \cup \cdots \cup A_n$. Note that if each $A_i = \{s_i\}$ is a singleton, then $\mathrm{Sh}(A_1, \cdots, A_n) = \mathrm{Perm}(S)$.

Theorem 5.2. *Let* $\mathbf{c} = (c_0, \cdots, c_m)$ *and* $\mathbf{d} = (d_0, \cdots, d_n)$ *be degree sequences. Letting* $A = \Delta(\mathbf{c})$, $B = \Delta(\mathbf{d})$, *we have*

$$\pi(\mathbf{c}) \cdot \pi(\mathbf{d}) = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathrm{Sh}(A,B)} \pi(\Sigma(\sigma, c_0 + d_0)).$$

More generally, for degree sequences $\mathbf{d}^1, \cdots, \mathbf{d}^r$, *and* $A_i = \Delta(\mathbf{d}^i)$, *we have*

$$\prod_{i=1}^{r} \pi(\mathbf{d}^i) = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathrm{Sh}(A_1, \cdots, A_r)} \pi(\Sigma(\sigma, d_0^1 + \cdots + d_0^r)).$$

Example 5.3. Let $\mathbf{c} = (0,3,5)$, $\mathbf{d} = (0,1,6)$ so that $\Delta(\mathbf{c}) = (3,2)$ and $\Delta(\mathbf{d}) = (1,5)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\mathbf{c}) \cdot \pi(\mathbf{d}) = \pi&(0,3,5,6,11) \\ &+ \pi(0,3,4,6,11) \\ &+ \pi(0,3,4,9,11) \\ &+ \pi(0,1,4,6,11) \\ &+ \pi(0,1,4,9,11) \\ &+ \pi(0,1,6,9,11). \end{aligned}$$

Before proving Theorem 5.2, we need a preliminary lemma. In the statement of this lemma, we will write $\mathrm{Prod}(S)$ for the product $s_1 \cdot (s_1 + s_2) \cdots (s_1 + s_2 + \cdots + s_r)$, where $S = (s_1, \cdots, s_r)$.

Lemma 5.4. *Let* $A = (e_1, \cdots, e_m)$ *and* $B = (f_1, \cdots, f_n)$ *be ordered sets. We have*

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathrm{Sh}(A,B)} \frac{1}{\sigma(1) \cdot (\sigma(1) + \sigma(2)) \cdots (\sigma(1) + \sigma(2) + \cdots + \sigma(m+n))} =$$
$$\frac{1}{e_1 \cdot (e_1 + e_2) \cdots (e_1 + \cdots + e_m) \cdot f_1 \cdot (f_1 + f_2) \cdots (f_1 + \cdots + f_n)}.$$

In terms of $\mathrm{Prod}(S)$, *the above formula can be rewritten as*

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathrm{Sh}(A,B)} \frac{\mathrm{Prod}(A) \cdot \mathrm{Prod}(B)}{\mathrm{Prod}(\sigma)} = 1.$$

More generally, if $A_1, \cdots, A_r$ *are ordered sets, then*

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathrm{Sh}(A_1, A_2, \cdots, A_r)} \frac{\mathrm{Prod}(A_1) \cdot \mathrm{Prod}(A_2) \cdots \mathrm{Prod}(A_r)}{\mathrm{Prod}(\sigma)} = 1.$$

Proof. The general statement for $A_1, \cdots, A_r$ follows from the one for A, B by induction, so it suffices to treat the latter.

Note that for any $\sigma \in \mathrm{Sh}(A,B)$ we either have $\sigma(m+n) = e_m$ or $\sigma(m+n) = f_n$. We can identify the set of σ with $\sigma(m+n) = e_m$ with $\mathrm{Sh}(A \setminus e_m, B)$ and likewise, identify the set of σ with $\sigma(m+n) = f_n$ with $\mathrm{Sh}(A, B \setminus f_n)$. Observe also that $\mathrm{Prod}(A) = \mathrm{Prod}(A \setminus e_m) \cdot (e_1 + \cdots + e_m)$ and similarly for $\mathrm{Prod}(B)$ and $\mathrm{Prod}(\sigma)$.

The preceding remarks allow us to write

$$\sum_{\sigma\in\mathrm{Sh}(A,B)}\frac{\mathrm{Prod}(A)\cdot\mathrm{Prod}(B)}{\mathrm{Prod}(\sigma)}=\frac{\sum_i e_i}{\sum_i e_i+\sum_j f_j}\cdot\sum_{\sigma\in\mathrm{Sh}(A\setminus e_m,B)}\frac{\mathrm{Prod}(A\setminus e_m)\cdot\mathrm{Prod}(B)}{\mathrm{Prod}(\sigma)}$$
$$+\frac{\sum_j f_j}{\sum_i e_i+\sum_j f_j}\cdot\sum_{\sigma\in\mathrm{Sh}(A,B\setminus f_n)}\frac{\mathrm{Prod}(A)\cdot\mathrm{Prod}(B\setminus f_n)}{\mathrm{Prod}(\sigma)}.$$

By induction,

$$\sum_{\sigma\in\mathrm{Sh}(A\setminus e_m,B)}\frac{\mathrm{Prod}(A\setminus e_m)\cdot\mathrm{Prod}(B)}{\mathrm{Prod}(\sigma)}=\sum_{\sigma\in\mathrm{Sh}(A,B\setminus f_n)}\frac{\mathrm{Prod}(A)\cdot\mathrm{Prod}(B\setminus f_n)}{\mathrm{Prod}(\sigma)}=1,$$

so we get

$$\sum_{\sigma\in\mathrm{Sh}(A,B)}\frac{\mathrm{Prod}(A)\cdot\mathrm{Prod}(B)}{\mathrm{Prod}(\sigma)}=\frac{\sum_i e_i}{\sum_i e_i+\sum_j f_j}+\frac{\sum_j f_j}{\sum_i e_i+\sum_j f_j}=1.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 5.2. The more general statement follows from the case of two degree sequences by induction, so we focus on the latter.

Shifting degrees, we may assume that $c_0=d_0=0$. We write $\Delta(\mathbf{c})=(e_1,\cdots,e_m)$ and $\Delta(\mathbf{d})=(f_1,\cdots,f_n)$. It is enough to check that for any $1\le k\le m$ and $1\le l\le n$ the diagrams on the left hand side and right hand side in the statement of the proposition have equal entries in position $(k+l,c_k+d_l)=(k+l,e_1+\cdots+e_k+f_1+\cdots+f_l)$.

If we let $A=(e_k,\cdots,e_1)$, $A'=(e_{k+1},\cdots,e_m)$, $B=(f_l,\cdots,f_1)$ and $B'=(f_{l+1},\cdots,f_n)$, then

$$\pi(\mathbf{c})_{k,c_k}=\frac{1}{\mathrm{Prod}(A)\cdot\mathrm{Prod}(A')},$$

and

$$\pi(\mathbf{d})_{l,d_l}=\frac{1}{\mathrm{Prod}(B)\cdot\mathrm{Prod}(B')}.$$

It follows that

$$(\pi(\mathbf{c})\cdot\pi(\mathbf{d}))_{k+l,c_k+d_l}=\frac{1}{\mathrm{Prod}(A)\cdot\mathrm{Prod}(A')}\cdot\frac{1}{\mathrm{Prod}(B)\cdot\mathrm{Prod}(B')}.$$

Turning attention to the right hand side, we observe that in order for $\pi(\Sigma(\sigma,0))_{k+l,c_k+d_l}$ to be nonzero, we must have that $\sigma(k+l)=c_k+d_l$. It follows that we can identify σ with a pair (τ,τ'), where $\tau\in\mathrm{Sh}(A,B)$ and $\tau'\in\mathrm{Sh}(A',B')$. It is then easy to see that

$$\pi(\Sigma(\sigma,0))_{k+l,c_k+d_l}=\frac{1}{\mathrm{Prod}(\tau)\cdot\mathrm{Prod}(\tau')},$$

so the entry of the right hand side in position $(k+l,c_k+d_l)$ is equal to

$$\sum_{\substack{\tau\in\mathrm{Sh}(A,B)\\ \tau'\in\mathrm{Sh}(A',B')}}\frac{1}{\mathrm{Prod}(\tau)\cdot\mathrm{Prod}(\tau')}=\left(\sum_{\tau\in\mathrm{Sh}(A,B)}\frac{1}{\mathrm{Prod}(\tau)}\right)\cdot\left(\sum_{\tau'\in\mathrm{Sh}(A',B')}\frac{1}{\mathrm{Prod}(\tau')}\right).$$

By Lemma 5.4, this is equal to

$$\frac{1}{\mathrm{Prod}(A)\cdot\mathrm{Prod}(B)}\cdot\frac{1}{\mathrm{Prod}(A')\cdot\mathrm{Prod}(B')},$$

which is what we wanted to prove. □

Remark. In Theorem 5.2, we see the advantage of our choice of pure diagrams: no new coefficients appear on the right-hand side.

Corollary 5.5. *Let $S = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Suppose that we have an S-module M and a decomposition of its Betti table*

$$\beta(M) = \sum_k a_k \, \pi(\mathbf{d}^k)$$

into pure diagrams. Let $f \in S$ be a homogeneous element of degree e that is regular on M. Then

$$\beta(M/(f)) = e \sum_k a_k \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathrm{Perm}(\Delta(\mathbf{d}^k) \cup e)} \pi(\Sigma(\sigma, d_0^k)) \right].$$

Proof. Write $K_\bullet(f)$ for the Koszul complex on f. Note that $\beta(K_\bullet(f)) = \pi(0, e)$. The hypothesis now implies that $\beta(M/(f)) = \beta(M) \cdot \pi(0, e)$. We now apply Theorem 5.2 and bilinearity to express $\beta(M/(f))$ as a sum of pure diagrams.

We have used that $\mathrm{Sh}(\Delta(\mathbf{d}^k), \{e\}) = \mathrm{Perm}(\Delta(\mathbf{d}^k) \cup e)$ to obtain the form above. □

Applying Corollary 5.5 inductively, we obtain decompositions of Betti diagrams of complete intersections over the polynomial ring.

Corollary 5.6. *Suppose that S/I is a complete intersection where $I = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ and $E = (e_1, \dots, e_n)$ such that f_i is of degree e_i. A convex Betti decomposition of $\beta(S/I)$ is*

$$\beta(S/I) = e_1 \cdot e_2 \cdots e_n \sum_{\sigma \in \mathrm{Perm}(E)} \pi(\Sigma(\sigma, 0)).$$

Remark. Using the notation in Corollary 5.6, notice that the multiplicity of S/I (denoted $e(S/I)$) is given by $e(S/I) = \prod_{i=1}^n e_i$. Hence Corollary 5.6 tells us that

$$\beta(S/I) = e(S/I) \sum_{\sigma \in \mathrm{Perm}(E)} \pi(\Sigma(\sigma, 0)).$$

If we are not concerned with the simplicial structure of the decomposition, then Corollary 5.5 and 5.6 can be used alongside Proposition 3.2 to decompose complete intersections of higher codimension.

Example 5.7. Let $R = k[x, y, u, v]$ and $I = (x^2, y^3, u^4, v^7)$. Let $M = R/(x^2, y^3, u^4)$ and observe that v^7 is regular on M. Using Proposition 3.2, we find that

$$\beta(M) = 42\pi(0,2,5,9) + 12\pi(0,3,5,9) + 36\pi(0,3,6,9) + 12\pi(0,4,5,9) + 42\pi(0,4,7,9).$$

Applying Corollary 5.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(R/I) = {} & 294\pi(0,7,9,12,16) + 84\pi(0,7,10,12,16) + 252\pi(0,7,10,13,16) \\ & + 84\pi(0,7,11,12,16) + 294\pi(0,7,11,14,16). \end{aligned}$$

Alternatively, by Corollary 5.6, we express

$$\beta(R/I) = 168 \sum_{\sigma \in \mathrm{Perm}\{2,3,4,7\}} \pi(\Sigma(\sigma, 0)),$$

a sum of 24 pure diagrams with the same coefficient.

In the complete intersection case, Corollary 5.6 gives an elegant decomposition of the Betti diagram in any codimension. It is natural to wonder if this decomposition generalizes to any module. In particular, does there exist a Betti diagram decomposition δ such that for S-modules M and N with $\operatorname{Tor}_i^S(M, N) = 0$ for $i > 0$, we have $\delta(M) \cdot \delta(N) = \delta(M \otimes N)$? Such a decomposition would have to respect Theorem 5.2 and be one step closer to creating a calculus for Betti diagrams.

6. Acknowledgements

We thank the MSRI and the organizers of the 2011 Summer Graduate Workshop in Commutative Algebra for making this work possible. We would especially like to thank Daniel Erman for several useful conversations. We also thank Zach Teitler, who originally proposed the problem that motivated our work. Additionally, Betti tables and other calculations in this note were inspired by many Macaulay2 [GS] computations. The interested reader should contact the authors if they would like Macaulay2 code for investigating these types of decompositions further.

References

[BS08] M. Boij and J. Söderberg, *Graded Betti numbers of Cohen-Macaulay modules and the multiplicity conjecture*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) **78** (2008), no. 1, 85–106.

[BS12] ______, *Betti numbers of graded modules and the multiplicity conjecture in the non-Cohen-Macaulay case*, Algebra Number Theory **6** (2012), no. 3, 437–454.

[EKKS12] S. El Khoury, M. Kummini, and H. Srinivasan, *Bounds for the multiplicity of Gorenstein algebras*, arXiv **1211.1316** (2012).

[ES09] D. Eisenbud and F.-O. Schreyer, *Betti numbers of graded modules and cohomology of vector bundles*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **22** (2009), no. 3, 859–888.

[GS] D. R. Grayson and M. E. Stillman, *Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry*, Available at http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/.

[HS98] J. Herzog and H. Srinivasan, *Bounds for multiplicities*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **350** (1998), no. 7, 2879–2902.

[McC12] J. McCullough, *A polynomial bound on the regularity of an ideal in terms of half of the syzygies*, to appear in Math. Res. Lett., available on arXiv **1203.6515** (2012).

[NS12] U. Nagel and S. Sturgeon, *Combinatorial interpretations of some Boij-Söderberg decompositions*, arXiv **1203.6515** (2012).

COURTNEY GIBBONS, UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, 203 AVERY HALL, P.O. BOX 880130, LINCOLN, NE 68588-0130
E-mail address: `s-cgibbon5@math.unl.edu`

JACK JEFFRIES, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH, 155 S 1400 E RM 233 SALT LAKE CITY, UT, 84112-0090
E-mail address: `jeffries@math.utah.edu`

SARAH MAYES, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, 4848 EAST HALL, 530 CHURCH STREET, ANN ARBOR, MI, 48104-1043
E-mail address: `mayess@umich.edu`

CLAUDIU RAICU, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, 1009 FINE HALL, PRINCETON, NJ, 08544-1000
E-mail address: `craicu@princeton.edu`

BRANDEN STONE, MATHEMATICS PROGRAM, BARD COLLEGE, P.O. BOX 5000, ANNANDALE-ON-HUDSON, NY 12504
E-mail address: `bstone@bard.edu`

Bryan White, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, MSC01 1115, 1 University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 87131-0001
E-mail address: `bcwhite@unm.edu`